

## Document Log Item

<b>Addressing</b>			
<b>From</b>		<b>To</b>	
"Steven Costa" <glatzeldacosta@suddenlink.net>		Sara Greiner/R9/USEPA/US@EPA	
<b>CC</b>		<b>BCC</b>	
<b>Description</b>		Form Used: Memo	
<b>Subject</b>		<b>Date/Time</b>	
Re: 2.9 MGD in existing permit		08/15/2007 08:03 AM	
<b># of Attachments</b>	<b>Total Bytes</b>	<b>NPM</b>	<b>Contributor</b>
0	8,816		Marcela VonVacano
<b>Processing</b>			
<b>Comments</b>			

Body

### Document Body

Sara,

I am not sure and would need to try to find old records from folks that are long gone. However, my best recollection is that the 2.9 mgd number is the capacity of the treatment system. The outfall was designed for potential expansion that has not occurred (I believe the existing combined permit limits are about 2/3 of pipeline the design flow). I will check to see if I can find anything more.

Where in the permit application is a potential reduction discussed (what is the context)? I do not think a reduction is planned in the foreseeable future. I know that production varies based on market on one side and supply of fish on the other. Given the current state of affairs and recent developments in Ecuador, I would not anticipate reductions. We need to ask StarKist (and COS) directly if it is an important point, however I do not think anything in the current permit is directly tied to production. This was purposeful because the variability that drive it are so unpredictable.

I am in my office this week and next. Will be on conference calls from 10:00 to 11:30 and 1:00 2:00 today, but am available otherwise. We are planning on going to Samoa on August 30. We will tentatively meet with the canneries on September 7th.

Steve

----- Original Message -----

From: <Greiner.Sara@epamail.epa.gov>  
To: "Steve Costa" <slcatgdc@earthlink.net>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 5:02 PM  
Subject: 2.9 MGD in existing permit

>  
> Hi Steve,  
>

> You helped straightened out the confusion on the 2.12 and 2.9  
MGD, with  
> the existing permit regulating Starkist's discharge at the 2.9  
MGD.  
> Thanks. However, I forgot to inquire about what the number  
represents.  
> Is it the cannery's design flow of the treatment or was it  
based on  
> historic effluent data such as the daily maximum or monthly  
average  
> flow?  
>  
> Also, the permit application indicated a possible reduction in  
the  
> average daily production of tuna (tons/day) during the permit  
term. Do  
> you happen to know why? Is it anticipated during the permit  
cycle?  
>  
> I am working really hard to get the draft ready for you by the  
end of  
> the month but have run into a few last minute details I am  
trying to  
> sort out-one of which we will probably have to discuss is  
toxicity  
> requirements. Are you in your office this week?  
>  
> sng  
>  
>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> Sara N. Greiner  
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
> Clean Water Act Standards and Permits Office  
> 75 Hawthorne Street, WTR-5  
> San Francisco, California 94105  
> Telephone: 415-972-3042  
> Fax: 415-947-3545

>  
>  
>

---